DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 882 JC 700 165

AUTHOR Stuckman, Jeffrey A.
TITLE Statewide Coordination of Community Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Nov 69
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.55
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Agencies, *Agency Role, Centralization, Cooperative Planning, *Educational Coordination, Educational Planning, Educational Policy, Educational Programs, Institutional Role, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Junior Colleges, Program Coordination, *State Agencies

ABSTRACT

The need for statewide coordinating agencies has become more evident as the number of junior colleges within each state continues to grow. These centralized agencies can assist in reducing unnecessary competition and duplication among junior colleges, and can improve the coordination of statewide educational needs with those of the individual institution. In developing a productive relationship between the coordinating agency and the junior colleges, some of the more important considerations are: precise definition of coordinating agency role and authority, recognition of mutual interdependence, and standardization of actions. Guidelines by which the agency staff operates in coordinating and implementing activities with the junior colleges can be seen as authority placement, institutional autonomy, institution-agency cooperation, and institution-agency conflict. Councils of institutional representatives improve the coordinating process by serving as forums providing feedback from the college to the coordinating agency. In conclusion, central agency practices that could insure coordination of the cooperative system and maximum feasible institutional autonomy include the development of a master program plan, a uniform accounting manual, and agreements with other institutions of higher education. A bibliography is included. (JO)

EDO 39882

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STATEWIDE COORDINATION OF COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

By

Jeffrey A. Stuckman

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

November, 1969

JC 700 165

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 09 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
CHAPTER	
I. THE NECESSITY FOR STATEWIDE COORDINATION	1
II. THE STATEWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE	8
Coordinating Agency-Institutional Relations in Perspective	8
Statement of Function-Implementation Guidelines for Junior College Coordination	28
Summary	31
III. ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF THE COORDINATING PROCESS	33
Involvement within the Coordinating Process	33
General Effective and Efficient Coordinating Function-Implementation Practices	36
Summary	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	41

FOREWORD

The phenomenon of state level coordination of higher education has developed rapidly and consistently during recent years. The need to study, to analyze, and to categorize state level activities relating to coordination and control of higher education is particularly important at the present time. The recent trends in coordination and control activities emphasize the need to understand them, particularly as they may impinge upon the operational decisions and activities of individual institutions. Ways must be sought to preserve the integrity of a single institution within a system of statewide coordination.

Accompanying these developments in state level activities are the recent clarifications of a systems theory. Using this theory as a basis for analyses of social and political organization the researcher is often able to identify elements of an organization, determine relationships among these elements, and evaluate these relationships.

This study is the first of a projected series of studies centered around an analysis of state level activities. There is a variety of organizational structures in the various states ranging from state level operational control of institutions to

very loosely organized state level consultant services to institutions. All of them affect institutional autonomy to some extent. The differences may not be as great as the structure may imply.

Jeffrey Stuckman has carried out the research activities in this first study by analyzing two states which represent a system wherein each college is under the operational control of a local board but is coordinated by a state level junior college board. The two states selected in this instance for study are Florida and Illinois. These two states are similarly organized and represent a time span of several years of development. His findings apply to this particular organizational structure but have implications for other structures. Further studies will determine the applicability of these findings to other states.

We are indebted to Dr. Gerald W. Smith, Executive Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board and to Dr. Lee G. Henderson, Director, Division of Community Colleges in Florida for their cooperative support and help. This monograph has been ably edited by Dr. Dayton Y. Roberts, Assistant Director, Institute of Higher Education. He is due our particular thanks.

James L. Wattenbarger
Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

CHAPTER I

THE NECESSITY FOR STATEWIDE COORDINATION

The community junior college, although appearing relatively late on the American higher education scene, is now the most numerous of any type of higher education institution. With much of its prodigious growth occurring in this decade, the junior college, public and private, constitutes more than one-half of the institutions of higher learning in this country, and a new junior college is appearing on the average of more than one per week. In September of 1968 alone, sixty junior colleges opened their doors to students for the first time. Few object to the expansion of the community junior college because it is through this institution that the opportunity for continued education beyond the high school becomes a reality for thousands of young people who cannot financially afford the cost of a state college or university education or who choose not to attend or are denied admittance to overcrowded public and private colleges and universities.

It has been remarked that seemingly every community wants its own junior college, whether for providing its citizens with an opportunity for a college education or for baser motives of enhanced status and prestige or the economic gain brought to the community. It would be axiomatic to state that order must be brought to the growing number

of community junior colleges. This staggering growth is one of the reasons, among many, that statewide coordination of public junior colleges has become inevitable if not, in fact, desirable. Whether or not this coordination is deemed necessary is no longer questionable. Russell has remarked that whenever any state system of higher education is comprised of two of more institutions some form of coordination is inevitable.[1]

Thus in nearly every state there is coordination of higher education although the mechanisms differ. If no statewide coordinating agency is established, the executive and particularly the legislative branches of state government by default do the coordinating of higher education via their decisions however ill prepared they may be. However, most states have opted not to leave statewide coordination to the uncertainties and vicissitudes of legislation and administrative edict. In point of fact, Pliner has concluded that the vast majority of states have accepted and necessity of coordination of higher education institutions' activities and are concentrating on making the established statewide coordinating agencies more effective in effectuating a quality system of higher education.[2]

Accepting the inevitability of coordination is one thing for community junior colleges to do; accepting the coordination of their activities is another. The concept of coordination is not compatible

---

[1]John Dale Russell, Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Michigan, p. 39.

[2]E. Pliner, editor, Coordination and Planning, p. 7.

with the traditional philosophy of the locally-governed community college. In attempting to meet the educational and occupational needs of its service community, each institution has paid little or no regard to the activities of its neighboring institutions. Commensurate with the pattern of local autonomy, each institution has traditionally developed its own philosophy, educational programs, and areas of interest.

Two interdependent trends with respect to statewide coordination are quite evident--the growing role of the statewide coordinating agency and the concomitant creation of or transformation to lay coordinating boards. The type of lay coordinating board which is predominate today has been in existence for little more than fifteen years. In the coordinating structure, this coordinating board is superimposed on the governing boards of individual institutions such as community junior colleges. The trend in the composition of this coordinating board has ramifications for the institutions, the activities of which the board is coordinating. To this point, Glenny has remarked that state legislatures and governors have delegated increasing authority to such boards with regard to statewide planning, budgets, educational and research programs, and other concerns relating to the expansion of the state higher education system. This same authority has not generally been extended by policy-making branches of state government to boards primarily composed of institutional presidents and governing board members.[3]

---

[3]Lyman A. Glenny, "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," Campus and Capitol, edited by W. John Minter, p. 28.

The genesis of the trend in the growth of statewide coordinating agencies can be found in the higher education community of the 1950's. In many states, each higher education institution was politically fighting for growth and, sometimes, survival while defining for itself its educational role within the state higher educational system. It became increasingly evident that this disorderly process was resulting in duplication of programs in some areas of the state and a dearth of programs to meet the endemic needs in other areas of the state. Consequently, to mitigate the unseemly competition and the duplication of programs in addition to reacting to burgeoning enrollments, escalating budgets, and the increasingly vocal demands for new institutions, coordination mechanisms were established. Ostensibly,during the 1950's, an awareness developed and heightened that allowing the provisions of higher education to remain solely in the province of the individual institutions does a disservice and injustice to any state's citizens because under such conditions there is an inevitable and necessary tendency for each institution to consider its welfare and aggrandizement ahead of the needs of the state higher educational program. In this vein, Wilson has commented that higher education has become too crucial for its development to be left to local institutions. Unilateral and piecemeal approaches to the paramount needs of the state citizenry no longer suffice. Moreover, the statewide needs must of necessity take precedence over the needs and desires of individual institutions.[4]

---

[4]Logan Wilson, "State Coordination of Higher Education," (Unpublished manuscript), p. 9.

In many states, the undesirable and confusion-causing competition among the public higher education institutions in addition to their increasing demands for state funds and the increasing costs of other state services brought about a situation in which the state legislature, generally with the enthusiastic support of the executive branch, established a statewide agency to coordinate the activities of the higher education institutions. The agency is engendered with the expectation that it will effect a more productive and efficient higher educational system. The statewide coordinating agency is thus established by the typical state legislature to economize, to increase efficiency, and to limit programs among the state's public higher education institutions, thereby overlooking the more positive purpose of promoting a more vigorous system of higher education.

In general, the reception given the statewide coordinating agency by the higher education community has not been ecstatic; many times it has been one of apprehension. Considering the prevailing milieu in which the agency is established, this apprehension is, many times, not without justification. The motivation of a state legislature in creating such an agency may be to eliminate ostensibly duplicating programs, to trim budget requests, or to retard the establishment of new institutions and the expansion of existing institutions. However, more enlightened state legislatures have created such agencies with the expectation of supporting a diversified higher education system which is planned and coordinated at the state level by the statewide coordinating agency and brought to the citizens of the state by institutions exercising that degree of latitude not inimical to meeting the expressed needs of the state.

Although institutional administrators, faculty, and governing board members may not enthusiastically greet the advent of the statewide coordinating agency, most realize that in order for their institution's vital needs to be met the over-all coordination of effort is imperative and that the disorderly process whereby each institution pleads its case in the public arena will no longer suffice. However, the process of coordination of effort and activities is not championed as, nor does it need be foisted upon higher education institutions as, the least inimical of all extant alternatives. The coordinating mechanism offers definite benefits for the higher education system in each state. In his nationwide, comprehensive study of state coordinating and governing agencies, Glenny found that legislators and institutional officers generally agreed that a statewide coordinating agency may lessen interinstitutional conflicts, may create a more favorable attitude toward higher education among legislators, and may establish legislative-supported long-range facility construction programs.[5]

With respect to the contributions a statewide coordinating agency for community junior colleges could make to these institutions, Johnson suggests that such an agency could effectively resist the efforts of local politicians and pressure groups to seek the aggrandizement of "their" community junior college to the detriment of the other junior colleges in the state system. Furthermore, each institution could be provided equitable financial support to insure that programs of nearly equal quality would be made available to students

---

[5]Lyman A. Glenny, Autonomy of Public Colleges, pp. 201-205.

regardless of their geographical location in the state. At the individual institution level, such an agency could be helpful in making expert and specialized assistance available.[6]

As has been noted above, statewide coordinating agencies for higher education are common today albeit distince in each state in which they appear. All have not enjoyed success in achieving the purposes for which they were established. In some states, the historical pattern of junior college development and the political climate have impeded the functioning of the statewide coordinating agency; in others, these factors have aided the agency relative to effecting its established purposes.

In summary, if the state's educational and occupational needs are to be met, if each citizen of the state is to be provided an equal educational opportunity beyond the high school no matter where he resides, and if the junior colleges are to develop in an orderly, planned manner, a statewide coordinating agency for junior colleges appears to be a necessity. By serving as a spokesman for the junior colleges, such an agency can keep the governor, the state legislators, and the citizens of the state informed relative to the purpose and potential of the junior college. With this increased understanding, the state and, most importantly, its citizens will be well served.

---

[6]B. Lamar Johnson, editor, State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Effectively?, p. 17.

CHAPTER II

THE STATEWIDE COORDINATING AGENCY AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Coordinating Agency-Institutional Relations in Perspective

There are presently twenty-two states which have established some type of state agency for the coordination of community junior college--as differentiated from two-year university branch or vocational-technical institute--activities. Moreover, in four states the junior colleges are coordinated by the state university. Statewide coordinating mechanisms are usually established as was indicated in Chapter I, to alleviate the competing requests for funds by the institutions, to mitigate the possibility of unnecessary overlapping and duplication of educational programs and services among the several higher education institutions, to assure the state's citizens that all essential educational services and opportunities are being provided for its youth, and to meet the imperative need for systematic and continuous long-range or master planning. Moreover, coordinating mechanisms have been established because increasingly members of the legislative and executive branches of state government desire expert advice in making major decisions about such complex matters as the establishment or expansion of junior colleges or other institutions of higher learning, the allocation of funds to each institution, and appraisal of new programs. Thus, it is evident that the statewide coordinating agency can be most

influential in areas and decisions relating to the vested interests of the higher education institutions whose activities are being coordinated. Pursuant to the statewide coordinating agency accomplishing the purposes for which it was established and pursuant to the higher education institutions meeting their needs, it is highly desirable, and indeed necessary, that a mutually-respective rapport be established and maintained between the agency and the institutions. It is with this topic, as applied to the state junior college system, that this chapter is concerned.

The question of coordination has not affected junior colleges as it has other institutions of higher learning. Because of the early establishment of junior colleges, e.g., in Illinois and California, as a segment of secondary education, which until quite recently has resulted in confusion concerning the place of this institution on the educational continuum, i.e., secondary of higher education, and because many junior college faculty and administrators have been recruited from the secondary school, the ostensibly mutually exclusive coordination versus institutional autonomy issue has not been so vehemently debated in junior college circles as it has been among state universities and four-year colleges. Moreover, the junior college coming relatively late to the coordination scene has completely skirted the voluntary coordination phase, which many state universities and colleges implemented in an effort to stave off statutory coordination. Thus, junior colleges have seemed to approach the coordination phenomena with a more neutral attitude than have other segments of the higher educational community.

In the past, junior colleges and other institutions of higher learning could develop and modify their goals and programs on a more individual basis with less concern about other institutions and with limited interference from outside agencies. Now with many junior colleges being members of the statewide systems of coordination, their projected purposes and programs must be integrated more consciously and deliberately with other institutions and with the broader educational needs of the state. In a state junior college system, the action of one institution affects directly or indirectly the functions of the other institutions. Thus, the period has passed when a junior college can be an island unto itself.

Since the individual junior college is no longer an entity beholden only to itself, but is rather a subsystem in the state junior college system, a distinct relationship must exist between each junior college and the statewide coordinating agency, which may also be viewed as a subsystem of the state junior college system. Ideally the relationship between these subsystems, i.e., the individual junior colleges and the statewide coordinating agency, should be complementary and mutually supportive. The junior colleges need the central leadership of the coordinating agency in order to achieve some of their purposes. The coordinating agency, operating as a servant of the state's populace, can facilitate the building, developing, promoting, and enhancing of the individual junior colleges. The mutually-supportive relationship will be enhanced if the coordinating agency acts so as to aid the individual junior colleges in meeting their needs especially if both the agency and the junior colleges have the same goal of improving the state junior college system.

Perhaps the determing factor pursuant to the relationship which exists between the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges is the degree of control and authority that the agency has or should have over the institutions. Too much authority vested in the agency is inimical to institutional autonomy; too little authority results in little or no coordination which is detrimental to the provision of quality education and, thus, to the state's welfare. The meaning and execution of the statutory authority granted to the statewide coordinating agency depends to a large extent on the obtaining of agreement from institutional representatives and legislators pursuant to the complex balance between the autonomy of the institutions and the fiscal and administrative requirements of the state.

If the process of coordination is to serve the state's welfare, the designated roles and prescribed authority of the statewide coordinating agency vis-a-vis the junior colleges should be precisely defined. This defined authority should be such that the agency is empowered to enforce adherance to specified institutional roles yet be flexible enough to accept modification of these roles. However, this necessitates the differentiating of the control of the junior colleges in the state system. There is the control and management of the internal operations of the individual institutions, and there is the coordination of the junior college activities pursuant to the state system. Since the activities involved in the process of coordination take place outside the individual institutions, the coordinating agency is best suited to deal with them. Conversely, the control and management of the internal operations of the individual

Institutions can best be relegated to a governing board concerned with only that institution, e.g., a board of trustees. Therefore, the statewide coordinating agency should have enough authority to implement its mandated functions but not the authority to interfere with institutional management functions which properly belong to institutional governing boards. For example, although the statewide coordinating agency must be alert to the educational needs of the state, it should not have the authority to compel a junior college to assume responsibility for an educational service which that institution does not desire to render.

In any state junior college system where there exists a coordinating agency and junior colleges whose activities are being coordinated, the inevitable question is raised: How much authority should the coordinating agency have, and how much does it need? Attempting to resolve this question, Browne has commented that in order to be effective a statewide coordinating agency should have sufficient authority to collect that information which it needs; it should have the prerogative to review new programs and the expansion of existing programs; and it should have the right to review the need for new institutions.[7] Moreover, operating in the interests of the state's welfare, the appeal to authority is a necessary recourse for the statewide coordinating agency, but this recourse must be tempered by and be subordinate to the need of each junior college to establish its distinct identity based on the needs of the community it serves.

---

[7]Arthur D. Browne, "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination," Long-Range Planning in Higher Education, edited by Owen A. Knorr, p. 49.

Concurrent with the concept of the statewide coordinating agency's authority is the concept of institutional autonomy. Agency authority and institutional autonomy are not mutually exclusive, but an inherent tension does exist between these two concepts. The statewide coordinating agency is confronted with the pressure from the legislature for more coordinated effort and with the desire for institutional autonomy from the community junior colleges. It must make certain that the junior colleges in the state system serve the broader public interest while preserving the identity, integrity, and morale of the individual institutions.

Institutional autonomy is necessary for the community junior college if it is to effect its traditional purpose of meeting its constituency's educational, occupational, and cultural needs. It must be relatively free to enunciate its basic aims, purposes or goals, i.e., its mission and role, in order to meet shifting local requirements and conditions in its service community, but the junior college must also realize that as an interdependent member of the state system it must be committed to help meet the needs of a larger community, i.e., the state, and that this may require a measure of subordination of its stated mission and role.

For some individuals who have addressed themselves to the concept of institutional autonomy, it is no longer sacrosanct but is rather undergoing a process of reexamination with the advent of increasing interdependency within a state system of higher education. For these individuals, the stress is placed upon higher education institutional autonomy being subordinated to the public welfare.

Browne has remarked that in this age of interdependence, when self-direction of an institution may infringe upon the autonomy of a larger public, institutional autonomy is not an inherent right; rather, institutional autonomy must be exercised within the context of the broader interests of the state and the higher education system.[8] Moreover, Glenny has commented that the primary responsibility of a statewide coordinating agency is the provision of an adequate educational opportunity for the citizenry of the state and that the preservation of any existing institution for its own sake is secondary.[9] Russell also concurs that the interests of the state as a whole must take precedence over those of any given institution of higher education.[10]

The import of the above-stated views is that the decisions, policies and procedures arrived at by individual junior college governing boards and administrators will tend to implement rather than supercede or amend policy established by the statewide coordinating agency because ostensibly the agency policy would reflect the interests of the state. Decisions on quality of programs, teaching and budgeting would remain in the purview of the local governing board and administrators, but decisions on over-all program and institutional expansion will be reached by the coordinating agency.

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 44, 47.

[9] Glenny, op. cit., p. 105.

[10] Russell, op. cit., p. 35.

In the interdependent state junior college system, the junior colleges are required to surrender some of their autonomy so that the statewide coordinating agency can authoritatively operate. However, this is a quid pro quo situation for the junior colleges. Institutional autonomy can be increased as a result of actions taken by the coordinating agency. For example, by bringing order to competition, the coordinating agency may relieve the junior colleges of possibly stricter state authority and bring new freedom and vigor as old state controls drop away. Thus, the statewide coordinating agency must find an acceptable balance between the authority it needs to safeguard the public interest and the autonomy which is necessary to safeguard the quality and productiveness of the junior colleges in the state junior college system.

Perhaps in the final analysis, the amount of institutional autonomy retained by each junior college depends to a large extent on the competence of its governing board members and administrators. When these individuals do not sufficiently meet their responsibilities, the statewide coordinating agency is oftentimes pressured to make decisions it otherwise would leave to institutional discretion. If the local institutional personnel meet their responsibilities, they pave the way for the agency to establish direction without sacrificing distinctive characteristics of individual institutions.

Effective coordination sometimes undeniably entails restraint pursuant to the individual junior colleges, but if coordination is something "done to" the junior colleges instead of "done with" these institutions, the results will be inimical to the state junior college

system and, consequently, to the citizens of the state. Participation by those affected in the coordinating process is not only essential for maintaining a measure of institutional autonomy but for insuring the state's welfare. Adopting the "done with" stance implies that the statewide coordinating agency would operate by cooperatively defining permissive limits with the assistance of the junior colleges rather than attempting to direct institutional activities. The collegial approach to defining discretionary boundaries within which the junior colleges operate would introduce an inherent degree of uncertainty regarding any given institution's response to varying circumstances, but, more importantly, it would engender the institutional latitude and flexibility so necessary for the junior colleges to possess if they are to adapt as local conditions change and take advantage of new opportunities as they arise.

If the coordinating process is to be something "done with" the junior colleges, this cooperation has to be based upon the mutual recognition and acceptance of interdependence by the junior colleges and the statewide coordinating agency comprising the state junior college system. The extent of the cooperation between the agency and the junior colleges whose activities it is coordinating will be enhanced if the goals of the state junior college system are mutually arrived at by the junior colleges and the agency, if the junior colleges significantly participate in the goal-implementation process, and if the benefits derived from the attainment of the goals are distributed commensurate with each institution's contribution to the goal-attainment process.

In seeking the cooperation of the junior colleges pursuant to the coordinating process, statewide coordinating agencies too many times direct their attention exclusively to the institutional administrators and overlook a most important element, viz., the teaching faculty. Implementing changes in institutional functions and program allocations and limiting the overexpansion of courses require the cooperation of teaching-faculty members as well as institutional administrators. As Glenny has delineated, there are two primary modes by which the teaching faculty may be influenced. Increasing faculty participation on interinstitutional committees dealing with subjects of interest to them is the most likely way of obtaining cooperation and agreement. Imposing the decision on the faculty while simultaneously attempting to obtain concurrence through information and persuasion is a second method.[11] He notes that the second method is inferior because it devolves into a public relations presentation instead of supplying the teaching faculties with the rationale for the stated policies.[12]

Cooperation within the state junior college system is, of course, desirable, but so is competition among the junior colleges in some instances. With respect to the program offerings of the several junior colleges in the state system, competition among institutions for excellence in quality of and the diversity of these programs should be encouraged by the statewide coordinating agency. Of course

---

[11]Glenny, op. cit., p. 85.

[12]Ibid., p. 86.

virulent competition in such an area as budget requests among the junior colleges whereby each is seeking to maximize its goals must be mitigated by the agency. In the interdependent state junior college system, some undesirable competition among the institutions is probably unavoidable because of the nature of the limited resources, e.g., the limited appropriation from the state legislature, but the statewide coordinating agency must continually strive to keep the competition in check, or some of the institutions will no longer identify with the state system. Consequently, the effectiveness of the agency would be dissipated.

A degree of conflict within the state junior college system is almost inevitable. Interinstitutional conflict as regards the allocation of appropriation funds for operating and capital expenses is quite probable. However, if the appropriations approach the combined budgeting requests of the junior colleges in the system, this interinstitutional conflict may be expected to subside. Besides the possible interinstitutional conflict, there may also be conflict between the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges which may result from the different operating postures of the agency and the institutions, thus, setting them at cross-purposes with each other.

Conflict within the state junior college system is not totally undesirable. Litwak and Hylton consider internal conflict to be a "given" in any coordinating system. In point of fact, they view it as requisite to the coordinating system's existence. They argue that if conflict were to be eliminated, it could only be done by either forsaking interorganizational relations or by consolidating the

participating organizations, e.g., the junior colleges, into a single authoritative structure. Either alternative would not only be inimical to, but would destroy the coordinating system as an entity.[13]

As regards the state junior college system, the statewide coordinating agency must operate so as to permit conflict to exist but not to the extent where such conflict destroys the system's equilibrium or the working relationship between the agency and the junior colleges or among the junior colleges. For example, the agency may find it necessary to "bargain" with the junior colleges if the coordinating function-implementation practices necessitate the modification of strongly entrenched institutional interests or be faced with an untenable situation in which conflict and its ramifications are rampant.

Although ostensibly the statewide coordinating agency and the institutions should be in agreement as regards the state junior college system's goals, the differing perspectives of the agency and the institutions may very well cause dysfunctions to exist in the state system. The statewide coordinating agency would probably be more concerned with quantitative geographic coordination, i.e., making certain that educational programs are distributed throughout the state. Conversely, the institutions would be concerned primarily with the qualitative aspects of their program offerings. The agency would place its emphasis on ascertaining systemwide needs, determining teaching-faculty demand and supply, improving relations with the state government and devising procedures for the equitable distribution of funds.

---

[13]Eugene Litwak and Lydia F. Hylton, "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (March, 1962), pp. 395-96.

Moreover, the agency is more sensitive to broad public sentiment and pressures, particularly those emanating from the legislature and influential taxpayers, and,consequently, it is less concerned with local community idiosyncrasies.

The individual junior college in the state junior college system is naturally most concerned with its operations and programs. It gives emphasis to such matters as student selection, curriculum revision, faculty recruitment and deployment, need for facilities, fund requirements, et cetera. The junior college is and must be concerned with providing needed educational services to the local community, as well as being sensitive to the dynamics of its students, teaching faculty, administrators and governing board.

Conflict between the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges will assuredly ensue unless there is effected some degree of convergence of agency and institutional perspective. Without a convergence of perspective, the institutions will continually perceive the agency as seeking to exercise control over some activity which they regard as being in their purview. Therefore, in the interdependent state junior college system, the extent of the activities of the agency and the institutions must be collegially defined. Moreover, the defining of activities is an on-going process because activities within the state junior college system must change to accommodate new conditions.

Pursuant to the above discussion which implies that 1) some institutional autonomy will be foregone--but that some restraints may fall away--so that the statewide coordinating agency may have authority commensurate with its responsibilities, 2) interinstitutional

and institution-agency cooperation and some interinstitutional competition is desirable, and 3) interinstitutional and institution-agency conflict is, to a degree, unavoidable and necessary, a consideration of the exchange concept is instructive. Considering the statewide coordinating agency and a single junior college in the state junior college system, any activity between these two organizations which has consequences actual or anticipated for the realization of their respective goals or objectives is a part of the exchange situation.[14]

In the actual exchange situation, there are four main dimensions: 1) the parties to the exchange, i.e., the agency and the institution; 2) the exchanged elements, e.g., allocations or information; 3) the agreement underlying the exchange which is formal, i.e., established by the state legislature; and 4) the direction of the exchange, i.e., the flow of elements can be unilateral or reciprocal.[15] For example, pursuant to a state master plan for junior colleges, if an institution is required to restrain its autonomy to the extent that it is not permitted to offer any educational program of its choosing but is rather designated, via program approval or disapproval pursuant to program requests submitted to the agency, those programs which are in keeping with the master plan; in return for cooperating, i.e., agreeing to offer the approved programs, the agency for its part in the exchange process allocates sufficient funds to the institution in order that it may offer the programs at a quality level.

---

[14]S. Levine and P. E. White, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (1961), p. 588.

[15]Ibid., p. 600.

The exchange process is quite necessary with respect to the interdependent state junior college system. The statewide coordinating agency has statewide objectives which it seeks to effect, and it controls resources which are useful and necessary for the junior colleges to possess if they are to realize their objectives. In this interdependent situation, it is quite natural that an exchange situation occurs whereby the agency, dependent upon the institutions to implement statewide objectives, would provide resources to the institutions who are dependent upon the agency for them. If the institutions perceive that they are receiving satisfaction commensurate with or greater than the burden of restrained autonomy pursuant to the exchange process, cooperation and a lessening of virulent competition or conflict will most likely prevail within the state junior college system. To this point, Barnard has stated that the system will remain in equilibrium and will continue to function as long as it can balance the burdens with the satisfactions.[16]

The exchange process implies reciprocity, and if the expectation of reciprocity on the part of the statewide coordinating agency is not met, the junior colleges may, and most probably will, become alienated from the state junior college system. Moreover, such institutions may also be expected to reject the state junior college system and withdraw from it as much as possible. The most frequent source of dissonance in the exchange process is that the participants to the process have different opinions of the value of their contributions

---

[16]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of an Executive, p. 56.

such that neither participant feels he is receiving commensurate value in return, i.e., each participant expects a greater quid for his quo than the other believes is warranted.

Since the expectation of reciprocity helps interrelationships to develop and to continue, and since interaction will falter without a mutual sense of the expectation of reciprocity operating in a relationship, it is imperative that the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges communicate sufficiently to resolve any differences in their expectations of relative contributions to the exchange process in order that the minimum of discord is present in the state junior college system. Not only can the agency rely on feedback from the junior colleges pursuant to the exchange process, but it can, moreover, analyze its past experience with the exchange process and its present observations of it. However, the perceptions of the agency and those of the junior colleges cannot be expected to be congruent because the perspective of the agency and the junior colleges is quite different.

Since the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges are subsystems of the state junior college system, it is necessary for the individual junior colleges to realize that a state of interdependency exists not only between each one of them and the agency, but also that such a state exists among them. Awareness of their interdependent state would subsume that they would recognize any action by one institution would directly or indirectly affect the others. Moreover, each institution would, it is further subsumed, take into account the goals of the other junior colleges in the system as it sought to maximize its own objectives.

In order to insure the maximum feasible autonomy for each junior college while promoting cooperation and seeking to diminish conflict, standardization of actions is imperative. Standardization of actions on the part of both the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges whose activities are being coordinated implies behavior that is reliably ascertained. If the behavior of each subsystem, i.e., junior college or agency, is predictable, it would be expected that informal or ad hoc types of coordination would be precluded. Moreover, the tendency to swing to the other extreme, i.e., the use of rigid, imposed rules, would be mitigated. Thus, in order for the agency or a junior college to coordinate its activities with the other subsystems in the state junior college system, it must have some knowledge by which to anticipate the behavior of the other subsystems--hence the need for predictability of actions.

In order to analyze the dynamics of interorganizational relations, Evan has devised the concept of "organization-set." An organization-set consists of the complex of roles and role relationships that the "focal organization," i.e., the organization that is the point of reference, has by virtue of its position with the network of organizations in its environment.[17] Applying this concept to the state junior college system, the statewide coordinating agency is the focal organization, and the junior colleges in the system are the elements in the focal organization's organization-set. The reader will note

---

[17]William M. Evan, "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Interorganizational Relations," Approaches to Organizational Design, edited by James D. Thompson, pp. 176-78.

the analogous relationship of the focal organization and its organization-set to the relationship of subsystems as generally accepted in systems concepts.

The size of the organization-set, i.e., the number of junior colleges in the state junior college system, is a determining factor in the discretion, i.e., autonomy, each junior college feels free to exercise and in the probability of either cooperation or conflict characterizing the system. As Evan suggests, with an increase in size of the organization-set, the focal organization may attempt to centralize authority to a greater degree in order to insure that its goals are not displaced by the actions of several elements in its organization-set.[18] As applied to the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges whose activities it is coordinating, any such attempt by the agency to increase its authority would portend a demise of institutional autonomy and an increase in institutional-agency conflict. However, as the size of the organization-set or the number of subsystems increases, Miller indicates that more differentiation of subsystems can be expected as well as more interdependence of subsystems.[19] This would suggest that as more junior colleges are established within a state, the trend would be toward differentiation in program offerings and more interdependency between the statewide coordinating agency and the individual junior colleges in effecting the state junior college system's objectives pursuant to the state's welfare.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 183.

[19] James G. Miller, "Living Systems: Cross Level Hypotheses," Behavioral Science, 10 (October, 1965), p. 405.

The state junior college system is a "natural system" in that the subsystems, i.e., the individual junior colleges and the statewide coordinating agency, depend on each other pursuant to the effecting of their respective objectives. Within the system boundary, there are interdependent forces at play in intimate interrelationship, producing a total effect on the whole system.[20] Moreover, while the state junior college system and its environment, i.e., the legislature, the other segments of the higher education community, the state populace, et cetera, are interdependently related, the set of forces within the state junior college system are more intimately related to each other than they are to forces outside the system. Thus, it is imperative that the statewide coordinating agency and the junior colleges mutually attempt to seek agreement on what is happening within the state junior college system and why it is happening.

One thing that is most probably occurring within the state junior college system (as is characteristic of all systems) is that the relations between the subsystems are tending toward a steady state, i.e., toward a balance of forces which is stable and enduring. This striving for the status quo, and thus against change, causes two tendencies to war during periods of change. One is striving to keep the stability already at hand; the other is striving toward a renewed and strengthened relation-presumably toward a longer-term and broader stability for the future than the present internal

---

[20]John A. Seiler, Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior, pp. 4-6.

balance allows.[21] It is imperative for the state junior college system that the tendency striving for a renewed relation predominate because as changing conditions within the system or changes impinging upon the system from the environment disturb the equilibrium within the system, as enthusiasms wane or as conflicts develop, the system must appropriately change to accommodate the new conditions. If the state junior colleges system does not change, it will eventually cease to function.

It is axiomatic that a stable balance of internal relationships, i.e., equilibrium, in the state junior college system is desirable, and Seiler has noted that system equilibrium is achieved via the feedback process.[22] It is manifestly important that the statewide coordinating agency seek out and respond accordingly to feedback received from the junior colleges as regards the coordinating function-implementation practices effect on their operations. If the agency cuts itself off from institutional feedback, the state junior college system will become dysfunctional and will be in disequilibrium. In this state, the process of coordination cannot take place.

The authority structure, institutional autonomy of junior colleges, cooperation, competition, conflict and the exchange process in the state junior college system have been discussed as entities and in the context of interorganizational relations and systems concepts. In the

---

[21] Ibid., p. 10.

[22] Ibid., p. 12.

next section, implications of this discussion are stated in the form of guidelines which are intended to aid in the enhancing of statewide coordinating agency and institutional relationships.

Statement of Function-Implementation Guidelines for Junior College Coordination

In this section, guidelines intended to aid in the enhancing of the relationship between the statewide coordinating agency for junior colleges and the junior colleges whose activities it coordinates are enumerated. Recognizing that the use of such guidelines would not involve their categorizing, they are categorized, nevertheless, in this section for the purpose of clarity. The reader will notice that even in this categorizing there is considerable overlap in the implications of the guidelines in one category for other categories. With respect to the discussion in the previous section of this chapter, the guidelines are categorized under the following headings: "General" (does not apply specifically to any other single category), "Authority Placement," "Institutional Autonomy," "Cooperation," and "Conflict." The guidelines are delineated below.

General

Pursuant to the implementation of coordinating functions, the professional staff of the statewide coordinating agency should:

1. Exercise the responsibility of coordinating the activities of the junior colleges in the state system via leadership, not control.
2. Seek to effect diversification of educational opportunity rather than impose uniformity and rigidity upon the institutions in the state junior college system.

3. Be as flexible as possible, within the limitations posed by the state's educational needs, with respect to each junior college achieving its purposes and goals.
4. Assist the junior colleges in their efforts to maintain services of high quality in the programs which they offer in order that the state junior college program will adequately serve the citizens of the state.

Authority Placement

Pursuant to the residence of authority as it pertains to the implementing of coordinating functions, the professional staff of the statewide coordinating agency should:

1. Require the minimum of movement of authority to make decisions from the institutional level to the agency level, especially with respect to the development of institutional programs within the context of a state junior college master plan.

Institutional Autonomy

In order that those junior colleges whose activities are being coordinated may retain the maximum feasible autonomy, the professional staff of the statewide coordinating agency in implementing coordinating functions should:

1. Reflect the recognition of the institutions' need for freedom and flexibility in adapting their programs to the particular requirements of the local communities as well as fulfilling their responsibilities to the larger community, i.e., the state.
2. Encourage each institution to function interdependently in the state junior college system but not to the extent that a junior college loses its institutional identity.

3. Devise rules and regulations which will not specifically apply to the operation of a single institution and which will not interfere with the internal management process whereby the local institutional representatives make essential decisions affecting the junior colleges' operations.
4. Respect the integrity of the structure of the roles and positions of institutional governing board members and administrators.
5. Abridge the stated mission and planned institutional character of a junior college only when the citizens of the state benefit from such an intrusion, and this benefit is generally recognized by all of the public junior colleges in the state system.[23]

Cooperation

For the purpose of enhancing institution-agency cooperation, the professional staff of the statewide coordinating agency in implementing coordinating functions should:

1. Promote on the part of the individual junior colleges the sharing of similar 1) values, 2) attitudes toward their responsibilities to the state populace as well as to their local service community, and 3) perceptions of the state junior college system's status vis-a-vis its environment so that a system-identification is fostered which recognizes the importance of cooperation.
2. Establish easily accessible lines of communication between the individual junior colleges and the agency and encourage their use as a means of promoting institution-agency cooperation and stability within the state junior college system.

---

[23]Browne, op. cit., p. 46.

3. Cooperate with the several institutions in the state junior college system to establish periodically specific divisions of responsibility between the agency and the institutions.
4. Cooperate with advisory bodies, e.g., junior college presidents, deans, teaching-faculty members, representing the local institutional point of view to formulate procedures which are most efficacious at the institutional as well as at the statewide level.
5. Periodically meet with each junior college president to discuss the aims, goals and problems of "his" institution.

Conflict

Pursuant to lessening avoidable conflict within the state junior college system, the professional staff of the statewide coordinating agency in implementing coordinating functions should:

1. Make the educational need of the local community and the state, rather than political advantage or expediency, the determining factor in allocating budgetary appropriations and/or approving or disapproving program requests in order that institution-agency conflict may be mitigated.

Summary

Salient factors of statewide coordination, interorganizational analysis, and systems theory has been considered as regards the implications of these concepts for the operation of a statewide coordinating agency vis-a-vis the junior colleges in a state junior college system. From these considerations, guidelines for coordinating function-implementation practices have been devised and categorized under the following interrelationship entities: 1) authority placement,

2) institutional autonomy, 3) institution-agency cooperation, and 4) institution-agency conflict.

CHAPTER III

ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF THE COORDINATING PROCESS

Involvement Within the Coordinating Process

With the initiation of a coordinating process in a state junior college system, the realization and awareness of the need for interdependency among the participants in the process does not automatically follow. The concept of an interdependent junior college system does not come easily to participants in a coordinating process. The perspective of a statewide system and the necessity of the coordination of junior college activities within this system must be nurtured. The role and purpose of the statewide coordinating agency in the coordinating process must be understood by the several junior college representatives before it can be accepted.

To internalize the necessity for interdependent action and the legitimacy of the statewide coordinating agency in the coordinating process, formal cooperation between the agency and the institutions is necessary. Bilateral cooperation between a single institution and the agency on an ad hoc basis will not suffice. The agency must assume the leadership role and initiate formal and on-going cooperation with the several junior colleges in the state. Probably the most efficacious method by which to effect such cooperation is via organizations (hereinafter called councils)

composed of institutional representatives by function, e.g., presidents, chief academic officers, chief student personnel officers, business managers, and teaching faculty.

Councils of the above-mentioned character serve to establish equilibrium within the junior college system. They do so by functioning as vehicles whereby the statewide coordinating agency receives feedback from the several junior colleges relative to the areas constituting the institutions' operations. If these organizations serve as forums such that the coordinating agency and institutional representatives can formulate procedures which facilitate the functioning of the institutions, the state junior college system will be well served.

It is appropriate that junior college representatives should actively participate in the formulating of recommendations to be forwarded to the statewide coordinating board because if the recommendations become board policy, the institutional representatives will be the ones directly affected. Via the consensus-reaching approach, unity within the state junior college system will probably be engendered because these institutional representatives will have had a role in formulating policies to which they will have to adhere at the institutional level.

If the councils serve as forums whereby the institutional representatives are actively involved and this involvement bears fruition, the identification of these representatives with the respective council and with the interdependent junior college system will most likely be enhanced. The degree of awareness of the need for interdependency, i.e., taking into account the effect of one

institution's actions on the other junior colleges within the system, and the need to operate in a complementary and mutually-supportive manner with the statewide coordinating agency held by the junior college representatives in the coordinating process is apparently directly related to the "coordination age" of the statewide coordinating agency. This awareness appears to accrue over time and with the experience of being actively involved in and with the coordinating process.

There is less chance for misunderstandings and misconceptions to arise within the context of a council meeting because communication channels are readily available and clarification can be easily sought. Moreover, adjustments in implementation practices, regulations, et cetera, which are generally recognized to be needed by the participants in the coordinating process to maintain the equilibrium of the junior college system, can be readily considered via the mechanism of a council.

The several junior colleges and the statewide coordinating agency cannot remain functionally separate without institution-agency conflict ensuing. Neither can the agency fulfill its responsibilities as it envisions them without consulting the several junior colleges which are affected by the agency's actions. The institutions must take part in formulating function-implementation practices and realize the necessity for such practices, or the coordinating process will not be sufficiently effective.

Effective and efficient statewide coordination of junior college activities with the preservation of institutional integrity, i.e., respect for the institution's stated role and character, can be

achieved if the statewide coordinating agency and the several junior colleges cooperate as equal and worthy partners in the state junior college system to effect mutually-accepted goals and if the agency and the institutions have mutually delineated their responsibilities pursuant to the attainment of the state junior college system's goals.

The council mechanism has been suggested in the above discussion as the most efficacious means to effect equilibrium within a state junior college system and to effect an understanding held by the participants in a coordinating process relative to the nature of that process and the concomitant need for interdependent action while at the same time insuring the autonomous identity of each junior college whose activities are being coordinated. The council mechanism only provides the opportunity for the previously-mentioned phenomena to occur. Whether or not this opportunity is utilized depends on the leadership provided by the statewide coordinating agency staff in the context of the council's functions and on the degree to which the junior college representatives are actively and meaningfully involved in relevant matters which they wish to consider in council meetings. Furthermore, recommendations which emanate from council proceedings must be seriously considered by the statewide coordinating board and its staff, or the council will cease to function adequately. If this occurs, the state junior college system will have forfeited one of its most, if not the most, stabilizing elements.

General Effective and Efficient Coordinating Function-Implementation Practices

Cognizant that an apparently successful practice by a coordinating agency may not necessarily engender the same degree of success if

implemented by such an agency in another state, it is, nevertheless, believed that there are several practices which, if modified commensurate with the particular needs and the political context of the state, would serve well the state and the junior colleges. It is therefore recommended that in an effort to effectuate effective, i.e., meeting the institution's needs, and efficient, i.e., meeting the state's educational needs, coordination of any state junior college system while retaining maximum feasible institutional autonomy, a state agency with responsibility for a state junior college system should seriously consider implementing the practices itemized below:

1. In order to achieve more effective statewide and institutional planning, each junior college should be required to develop a master plan for campus development and for program development, e.g., transfer, occupational, adult, guided studies, community service, et cetera, and these master plans should be reviewed by the agency staff. In addition, the agency staff and the several junior colleges should also plan programs on a regional basis.
2. As a requisite to effective institutional and statewide planning, a uniform accounting manual for the junior college system should be compiled, with the several junior college business managers actively involved in its formulation, to serve as the basis of a management information system at each institution. This manual should also be the basis of effecting a planning programming budgeting system. The comparable data generated by the individual management information systems should be utilized by the agency staff 1) to serve as a basis for long-range planning

of the state's needs and for the program planning necessary to meet these needs, 2) to provide more accurate projections of student enrollment and the physical facilities needed to house these students, and 3) to provide an account of those segments of the population which are not being served by the junior college. Instructional research using the data provided by unit cost studies should be undertaken to seek the most effective and efficient instructional methods.

3. The state agency should provide the leadership necessary to effect articulation agreements between the several junior colleges and the senior institutions not only at the institutional level but also within the institutions at the divisional level, i.e., a division of the junior college and a division of a four-year college or a college within a university.

4. With respect to activities, e.g., accreditation and institutional evaluation, with which organizations from outside the state junior college system are concerned and which are similarly of concern to the state agency, the agency staff should take the initiative to effect coordination of these activities with those of outside-the-system organizations. Decreasing such duplication of effort will serve to lessen the institutional administrators' and teaching-faculty members' time devoted to and occupied by such activities.

5. For the purpose of enhancing institution-agency cooperation and effecting a better understanding on the part of institutional representatives of the coordinating process within the context of a state junior college system, the state agency should

establish separate organizations for 1) the presidents of the several junior colleges in the state, 2) the chief academic officers, 3) the chief student personnel officers, 4) the business managers, and 5) a representative elected by the teaching faculty of each junior college in the state. A state agency staff member should preside as chairman of each of the five organizations. These state agency staff members and several representatives from each of the five organizations should serve as a state coordinating committee so that communication among the organizations is expedited.

6. In order to enhance interinstitutional and intrainstitutional communication, the state agency should publish a periodical devoted to the activities of these five organizations. These five organizations should sponsor annual meetings to discuss *matters relevant and pertinent to the state junior college* system.

The above-stated six recommendations are suggested as being amenable to implementation by a state agency whether it be a governing agency or a coordinating agency. Moreover, the recommendations may be implemented by such a state agency and not be contrary to state law or regulations in most, if not all, states.

Summary

The council mechanism has been discussed as a means by which institutional representative involvement in the coordinating process can be effectuated. Via the council mechanism, equilibrium within the junior college system may be established, the realization of the need

for interdependent action may be engendered, institutional representatives may participate in statewide policy formulation and reach consensus, and an increased understanding of functioning within the coordinating process may result. Six recommended function-implementation practices have been offered for consideration by a state agency which has the responsibility of coordinating or governing the activities of the community junior colleges in the state. With the implementation of these six recommended practices, it has been suggested that more effective, i.e., meeting the institution's needs, and efficient, i.e., meeting the state's educational needs, coordination of community junior college activities may be effected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Axelrod, Joseph, et al. Autonomy and Interdependence: Emerging Systems in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of an Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Berdahl, Robert O. "The State Planning and Coordinating Agency for Higher Education." Paper prepared for the Sixteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board, August 27-29, 1967.

Berdahl, Robert O. A Study of Statewide Systems of Higher Education (working title). Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education. In press.

Brouillet, Frank B. Coordination of Higher Education: An Overview with Emphasis on the State of Washington. Seattle: Center for the Development of Community College Education, University of Washington, 1968.

Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination," Long-Range Planning in Higher Education, Owen A. Knorr, ed. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1964, pp. 39-51.

Brumbaugh, A. J. State-wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

Bunnell, Kevin P. and Julia Vadala, eds. Effective State Board Leadership in Community College Development. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, February, 1969.

Chambers, M. M. Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1961.

Clark, George W. A Study of Statewide Organizational Structures for Community Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Berkeley: University of California, 1966.

DeZonia, Robert H. "Coordination Among Higher Institutions in Wisconsin," Educational Record, 44:288-93, July, 1963.

Erickson, C. G. "Illinois Balances Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy," Junior College Journal, 38:22-26, March, 1968.

Evan, William M. "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Interorganizational Relations," Approaches to Organizational Design, James D. Thompson, ed. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1966, pp. 175-91.

Glenny, Lyman A. Autonomy of Public Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Glenny, Lyman A. "How Will Effective Institutional Articulation and Coordination Be Achieved at the Local, the State, the Regional, and the National Level?" Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1957, pp. 156-61.

Glenny, Lyman A. "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," Campus and Capitol, W. John Minter, ed. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966, pp. 27-46.

Glenny, Lyman A. "State Systems and Plans for Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Logan Wilson, ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965, pp. 86-103.

Gove, Samuel K. Statewide Systems of Public Higher Education: An Analysis of Current Studies on the Topic. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1967.

Green, Ralph T. "The Need for Coordination and Controls in the Financing of State Institutions," Proceedings of the 55th Annual Conference of the National Tax Association, 1962. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: National Tax Association, 1963, pp. 476-82.

Hall, Charles W. The Position and Function of the State Office Responsible for Public Community-Junior College Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

Hall, C. W. "Status of the State Officer Responsible for Junior College Education," Junior College Journal, 38:32-34, March, 1968.

Henry, D. D. "Institutional Cooperation and Coordination in Meeting New Responsibilities," North Central Association Quarterly, 32:318-24, April, 1958.

Holderman, Kenneth L. "State Coordination of 2-Year Colleges with Other Educational Institutions," State Directors of Junior Colleges and Coordinators of State Systems of 2-Year Colleges. Conference Proceedings, Chicago, Illinois, October 18-19, 1961. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1961, pp. 42-48.

Hurlburt, Allan S. State Master Plans for Community Colleges (working title). Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, to be published during 1969.

Ingler, C. W. "Governing Principles for State Policy Toward Community Colleges," Educational Research Bulletin, 40:29-35, February, 1961.

Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. State Junior Colleges: How Can They Function Effectively? Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965.

Levine, S. and P. E. White. "Exchange As a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5:583-601, 1961.

Litwak, Eugene and Lydia F. Hylton. "Interorganizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6:395-420, March, 1962.

Martorana, S. V., ed. Coordinating 2-Year Colleges in State Educational Systems. Washington, D. C.: Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education, 1957.

Martorana, S. V. and Ernest V. Hollis. State Boards Responsible for Higher Education. U. S. Office of Education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Martorana, S. V. "State-Wide Coordination of Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962, pp. 245-48.

McConnell, T. R. "The Coordination of State Systems of Higher Education," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Logan Wilson, ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965, pp. 129-40.

McConnell, T. R. A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McConnell, T. R. "The University and the State: A Comparative Study," Campus and Capitol, W. John Minter, ed. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966, pp. 89-118.

McLure, M. P. "Our Junior Colleges: The Argument for a State System," Illinois Education, 51:243-44, February, 1963.

Miller, James G. "Living Systems: Cross Level Hypotheses," Behavioral Science, 10:380-411, October, 1965.

Miller, James L., Jr. "The Two Dimensions of State-wide Higher Education Coordination," Educational Record, 43:163-67, April, 1962.

Millett, John D. "State Planning for Higher Education," Educational Record, 46:223-30, Summer, 1965.

Minter, W. John, ed. Campus and Capitol. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

Moos, Malcolm and Frances E. Rourke. The Campus and the State., Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

Palola, Ernest G. "Changing Centers of Power in Higher Education: A Challenge to Institutional Leadership." Paper prepared for the Junior College Presidents Seminar, June 21, 1968, Berkeley, California.

Palola, Ernest G. Statewide Planning in Higher Education: A Study of Planned Organizational Change. Unpublished preliminary outline. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1966.

Paltridge, James G. California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1968.

Paltridge, James G. Conflict and Coordination in Higher Education. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1968.

Paltridge, James G. Organizational Forms Which Characterize Statewide Coordination of Public Higher Education. Unpublished manuscript, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1965.

Pliner, E., ed. Coordination and Planning. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Public Affairs Research Council, 1966.

Reitz, J. Wayne. "The Impact of State Systems on Institutional Autonomy." Paper presented to Sectional Meeting 14 at the 23rd National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 4, 1968.

Russell, John Dale. Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Michigan. Staff Study Number 12 prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. Lansing: The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, 1958.

Seiler, John A. Systems Analysis in Organizational Behavior. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin and the Dorsey Press, 1967.

Stuckman, Jeffrey A. Coordination of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1969.

Stuckman, Jeffrey A. Practices and Institutional Effects of Function-Implementation by the Professional Staff of State-Wide Coordinating Agencies for Public Junior Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1969.

Wattenbarger, James L. "Changing Patterns of Junior College Control: Local to State Government," Junior College Journal, 33:9-16, May, 1968.

Wattenbarger, James L. "The Development of Community Colleges: Trends, Issues, Problems," Partnership for Progress, the report of a legislative work conference on Higher Education in the West, December 3-5, 1967, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 45-51.

Wattenbarger, James L., William A. Gager, and Jeffrey A. Stuckman, The State Director for Community Junior Colleges. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1969.

Wilson, Logan. "State Coordination of Higher Education." Paper presented to the Association for Higher Education and the Washington Education Association, Seattle, Washington, December 2, 1966.